

MILFORD PLANNING BOARD PUBLIC HEARING
February 25, 2014 Board of Selectmen's Meeting Room, 6:30 PM

Present:

Members:

Janet Langdell, Chairperson

Kathy Bauer

Chris Beer

Steve Duncanson

Judy Plant

Tom Sloan, Vice Chairman

Susan Robinson, Alternate member

Staff:

Jodie Levandowski, Town Planner

Bill Parker, Community Development Director

Shirley Wilson, Recording Secretary

Nick Giakus, Videographer

Excused:

P. Amato

MINUTES:

1. Approval of minutes from the 1/7/14 and 1/21/14 meetings.

NEW BUSINESS:

2. **Thomas Lorden – Off Crestwood Ln – Map 49, Lot 2;** Review and recommendation for a parcel without frontage on a Class V road or better.
(*Ref: ZBA case #2014-02*)
3. **Share Outreach, Inc – Columbus Ave – Map 25, Lot 126;** Public Hearing for a site plan amendment to construct a 2,300SF addition with associated site improvements and; waiver requests from the Milford Development Regulations, Section 5.04.KK, *Landscaping Plan* and Section 5.04.LL, *Stormwater Management Plan*.
4. **Laurie Shiffer/Classic Bay Farm – Ponemah Hill Rd – Map 54, Lot 13-2;** Public Hearing for a major site plan to construct an indoor equestrian riding arena with attached stalls and associated site improvements.
(*Fieldstone Land Consultants PLLC*)
5. **John Samonas/TMC CF of New England LLC – Nashua St – Map 44, Lot 11;** Public Hearing for a major site plan for a proposed retail convenience store and gas sales with associated site improvements.
(*MHF Design Consultants*)
6. **Dorothy Lorden Family Trust & Frederick Lorden Rev Trust/Great Bridge Properties – Capron Rd & Nashua St – Map 43, Lots 55 & 57;** Public Hearing for a major site plan to construct a three (3) building apartment complex with associated site improvements and; a waiver request from the Milford Development Regulations, Section 6.05.1:D, *Off street parking*.
(*Keach Nordstrom Associates*)
7. **St. Joseph Hospital et.al./ Milford Medical Center – Nashua St – Map 31, Lots 32 & 32-1 and Map 32, Lot 1;** Public Hearing for a lot line adjustment involving three (3) lots.
(*Meridian Land Services*)

OLD BUSINESS:

8. **St. Joseph Hospital et.al./ Milford Medical Center – Nashua St – Map 31, Lots 32 & 32-1 and Map 32, Lot 1;** Major site plan to construct a new medical facility with associated site improvements and; respective waiver requests from the Milford Zoning Ordinance, Article VI, Section 6.05.0; *Nashua and Elm Street Corridor District*, in accordance with the Milford Development Regulations, Section 5.020.
(*Tabled from 1/21/14 meeting*)
9. **Carol Colburn – Osgood Rd & Woodhawk Dr – Map 51, Lot 1;** Major open space subdivision creating twenty-seven (27) new residential lots.
(*Tabled from 1/21/14 meeting*)

Chairperson Langdell called the meeting to order at 6:35PM noting that this meeting is a result of the postponement of the 2/18/14 meeting due to inclement weather. She then explained the ground rules for the public hearing, introduced the Board and Staff, and read the agenda into the record.

MINUTES:

S. Duncanson made a motion to approve the minutes from the 1/21/14 meeting. K. Bauer seconded. C. Beer abstained and all else voted in favor. S. Duncanson made a motion to table approval of the minutes from the 1/7/14 meeting. C. Beer seconded and all else voted in favor.

NEW BUSINESS:

Dorothy Lorden Family Trust & Frederick Lorden Rev Trust/Great Bridge Properties – Capron Rd & Nashua St – Map 43, Lots 55 & 57; Public Hearing for a major site plan to construct a three (3) building apartment complex with associated site improvements and; a waiver request from the Milford Development Regulations, Section 6.05.1:D, *Off street parking*.

Chairperson Langdell read correspondence from Anthony Basso, Keach Nordstrom, Inc. dated 2/18/14.

S. Duncanson made a motion to table the application to the March 18, 2014 meeting per the applicants' request. C. Beer seconded and all in favor.

Carol Colburn – Osgood Rd & Woodhawk Dr – Map 51, Lot 1; Major open space subdivision creating twenty-seven (27) new residential lots.

Chairperson Langdell read correspondence from Randy Haight on behalf of Carole Colburn, dated 2/25/14.

C. Beer made a motion to table the application to the 3/18/14 meeting. S. Duncanson seconded and all in favor.

Thomas Lorden – Off Crestwood Ln – Map 49, Lot 2; Review and recommendation for a parcel without frontage on a Class V road or better
Abutters were not notified, but Thomas Quinn was present.

Chairperson Langdell recognized:
Wil Sullivan, Cheever & Sullivan, PA

W. Sullivan stated that the applicant is scheduled to meet with the Board of Selectmen on 3/10/14 and we are asking the Planning Board to review and comment on our request, pertaining to ZBA Case 2014-02 to build a house on a lot without the required frontage. He distributed a plan showing the approximate location of the proposed building and said it's an odd statute because there are no driveway limitations in town and this is not uncommon, he's been doing these for decades. There are numerous driveways that are much longer than this one. This easement is about 50ft in length going from Crestwood Dr, a town road, to the building envelope and emergency services will have full access. J. Langdell referenced the staff memo from Bill Parker dated 2/18/14.

S. Duncanson referenced the statute and town counsel's comments and said he was not sure how we can approve this. We will be setting precedence for every back lot in town without frontage on a road. W. Sullivan read section 674:41.1(d) and stated that if you couldn't build then it would be a taking. J. Langdell clarified that although the statute may not be very clear, this is allowed, with the process of review and there are a number of cases in Town that have been approved by the ZBA. It just recently came to light from Attorneys Sullivan and Quinn that our process was missing this step. B. Parker added that any owner of a land locked property would be allowed to do this and would have to go through this same process; ZBA, Planning Board and the Board of Selectmen. The first step is always the ZBA and Mr. Lorden has received their approval, actually twice. S. Duncanson then inquired about the easement and if it would get lost with future land sales or possible future subdivision of the fifteen (15) acre lot. J. Langdell said that any future subdivision or change in use would have to come before the Planning Board and there are many other pieces that would come into play. W. Sullivan stated that the easement has already been recorded. C. Beer read from the recorded driveway easement document and

verified that the driveway is bound to the property, not to the individual. K. Bauer added that the ZBA granted the variance for a single family residence.

T. Sloan inquired about the topography of the property and asked if the driveway grade would be greater than 6%. R. Reindeau said the driveway apron has been constructed to Town standards. He only inspects 15-20 ft from the street and does not know what the grade further in is, but didn't really see any issues with topography. W. Sullivan stated that the applicant wouldn't put money into a driveway they couldn't build. T. Sloan suggested that we could indicate to the BOS that the house be located so that the driveway not have greater than a 6% slope. J. Langdell said it would have to be constructed to all the regulations and specifications we have and within all our existing processes. J. Levandowski added that the Building Department and DPW coordinate with each other when it comes to issuance of building permits and all departments' requirements need to be met before a C/O is issued.

C. Beer made a motion that this Board has reviewed this request and there are no conditions that would preclude issuance of a building permit. J. Plant seconded. T. Sloan abstained as he was not present for the entire presentation and all else voted in favor. The Chairperson will craft correspondence for the Board of Selectmen stating that the Planning Board has reviewed the request and has no concerns relative to issuing a building permit on this property.

Share Outreach, Inc. – Columbus Ave – Map 25, Lot 126; Public Hearing for a site plan amendment to construct a 2,300SF addition with associated site improvements and; waiver requests from the Milford Development Regulations, Section 5.04.KK, *Landscaping* and Section 5.04.LL, *Stormwater Management*.
No abutters were present.

Chairperson Langdell recused herself.

Vice Chairman Sloan recognized:

Bob Moulton, Board of Directors, Share Outreach, Inc.

Christine Janson, Executive Director, Share Outreach, Inc.

Cynthia Dokmo, Chairperson of Board of Directors for Share Outreach, Inc.

T. Sloan read the notice and background into the record. J. Levandowski stated that the application was complete. C. Beer made a motion to accept the application. S. Duncanson seconded and all in favor. S. Wilson read the abutters list into the record. C. Beer made a motion that this application did not pose potential regional impact. S. Duncanson seconded and all in favor.

J. Levandowski clarified that the background pertaining to the Elm Street Corridor District in the staff memo was based on the initial review of the plans and upon further review with staff, it was determined that this is an existing non-compliant site and the addition will be over existing impervious area. She then referenced the memo from Bill Parker dated 2/19/14.

B. Moulton presented plans dated 1/27/14 and gave an overview of the project. The primary reason for this addition is because we are running out of space. We've been in the building for five years and we've seen a significant increase in the amount of clients we serve each month. We need additional office space and would like to increase the size of our food pantry.

T. Sloan inquired if the site met the 30% open space requirements. B. Moulton replied that he is not sure if that gravel area is considered pervious or impervious, but it's dirt now and he can check on the calculations. K. Bauer asked what if it doesn't meet the requirements; can that be a condition of approval? J. Levandowski added even if the gravel parking area is removed from the calculations, the overall open space on the site will not be changing in regards to the addition. It will be constructed over impervious area so the open space will not be decreasing. It is a pre-existing site and these conditions already exist. T. Sloan asked if the addition would be beautified with any foundation plantings. B. Moulton said you can't really see the site from the road but that's certainly something we could look at; however, no determination has been made yet.

B. Moulton reviewed the waiver requests and stated that there will be no change to the landscaping or stormwater runoff with this addition. It is a straightforward request.

Vice Chair Sloan opened the hearing to the public for comment.

C. Janson said we have been in that building for five years and the Knights of Columbus hall was not designed for what we do there. Currently, our clients come from five communities and about 85% are from Milford. We don't have confidential space for clients so we're trying creating more appropriate office space for the work that we do. We will also be expanding the pantry as our client base is expanding and we would like to serve them better. This is the most cost effective way to do that and this site will actually look better with the addition. We appreciate the Board considering this.

The public portion of the meeting was closed

S. Robinson agreed with the idea of plantings which will also benefit the clients. K. Bauer also agreed and said although it is not essential, floral plantings would be a good idea. Maybe funds could be raised for that.

S. Duncanson made a motion to grant a waiver from Section 5.04.KK of the Milford Development Regulations. C. Beer seconded for discussion. J. Levandowski noted that the applicant can still work with staff to beautify the site even with the waiver request granted. T. Sloan said the applicant seemed open to the consideration to do some floral plantings or some type of landscaping improvements and the improvement to the site with the addition would outweigh any requirements for landscaping. B. Moulton added that a couple of bushes may have to be moved or replaced as a result of the addition but will that will be done. A vote was called and all in favor.

K. Bauer read the letter from Conservation Commission dated 2/24/14. T. Sloan asked if there would be any repaving on the site. B. Moulton replied not at this time. T. Sloan said the Conservation Commission comments have just alluded to the gravel area being permeable.

C. Beer inquired if a waiver from the stormwater requirements was needed if this site was under the threshold per comments from the Environmental Coordinator and discussion regarding drainage on the existing site followed.

S. Duncanson made a motion that a waiver from Milford Development Regulations, Section 5.04.LL Stormwater would not be required. K. Bauer seconded and all in favor.

S. Duncanson made a motion to approve the application. C. Beer seconded and all in favor.

Laurie Shiffer/Classic Bay Farm – Ponemah Hill Rd – Map 54, Lot 13-2; Public Hearing for a major site plan to construct an indoor equestrian riding arena with attached stalls and associated site improvements.

Abutters present:

Mark Johansen, Ponemah Hill Rd-Milford

John & Carol Hopfenspirger, Ponemah Hill Rd-Amherst

Chairperson Langdell recognized:

Chris Guida, Fieldstone Land Consultants, PLLC

Laurie Shiffer, Classic Bay Farms

John Griffin, Jr. PLLC, Griffin Law Offices

J. Langdell read the notice into the record and stated that the application was complete per the staff memo. S. Duncanson made a motion to accept the application. C. Beer seconded and all in favor. C. Beer made a motion that this application did not pose potential regional impact. S. Duncanson seconded for discussion and said he believed there was regional impact as it borders Amherst and the shared driveway is in partly in Amherst. J. Levandowski read RSA 36:55. C. Beer and S. Duncanson withdrew their motions. S. Duncanson made a motion that this application did pose potential regional impact to Amherst. C. Beer seconded. K. Bauer, S. Robinson, T. Sloan, J. Plant, C. Beer and S. Duncanson voted in the affirmative. J. Langdell voted in the negative. The motion carried by a vote of 6-1. S. Wilson read the abutters list into the record.

C. Guida presented plans dated 2/21/14 and described the property and proposed project. We are proposing to raze the existing barn and replace it with a new barn so that the stables, tack room, riding ring and office will all be in one location. Ms. Shiffer has lived there for twenty years and has owned horses the whole time, so the use is staying the same. L. Shiffer explained that she houses anywhere between 8-14 horses but will always have eight. she has ten horses now and would like to keep it at that. C. Guida stated that the proposed indoor riding arena is an acceptable and permitted use in the zone. All construction will be done in the existing open field with a few minor modifications to the site. There will be no land clearing and not much change to the site except that the new building will be larger.

C. Guida reviewed the comments from the staff memo dated 2/25/14.

- We've met with the Fire Department and this plan was revised, based on Captain Smedick's requirements to show the required access to three sides of the building; he had no other comments on this proposal. The 20ft wide accesses will be 25ft away from the building and the materials will support the weight of fire apparatus. J. Levandowski added that Captain Smedick would like to review the revised plan.
- Fred Elkind has made some comments regarding the submitted a stormwater management plan. We've made a few minor modifications and are working with him to finalize the remaining details.
- A note has been added that all lighting will be downcast which will be localized wall mounted sconces.
- A note has been added that Ponemah Hill Rd is a scenic road.
- A note has been added that no manure will be stored on site. The manure goes into a trailer parked in the barn and is trucked off site and composted.
- The snow storage area was shown.
- A detention basin was created to prevent any additional runoff and there will be no increase from what is there now.
- No other impervious areas or disturbance is proposed.
- There will be no impact to buffer or the wetlands.
- No waivers are being requested.
- The comments from Annmarie Pinal Turcotte pertaining to traffic, parking and aesthetics have been addressed. We have added a note to the plan that there will be no parking on the common driveway. Ms. Shiffer has specifically chosen a building that is in keeping with aesthetics of a rural residential area. It was really important to go with a wood frame, the asphalt roofing and siding to keep in character with the neighborhood and it would be a great asset to property.

J. Langdell inquired about the parking. C. Guida said there is very little need for a large parking area. Three (3) spaces would be more than adequate. If there were a need for more, she could use the area near the old barn as most of the corrals will be torn down and reconfigured outside the new stalls. L. Shiffer described the current conditions and stated that the wood fencing will all be coming down. The perimeter of the property will be fenced in using triple-crown fencing and the paddocks will be reconfigured to again allow for in/out access for fire purposes. The fields will remain for the horses. K. Bauer said she was not comfortable with a site plan that only shows three (3) spaces. J. Shiffer then described the current operations. I am the trainer, instructor, coach and the property caretaker and she parks at her house. There is one person who helps out and she will park by the new building. There isn't a need for delineated parking and I'm trying to keep this rural. I teach private (1-2 person) classes on Monday, Wednesday and Friday so there may be an overlap of one or two clients, but I can put up a sign for parking. I professionally compete throughout the east coast, so most of the horses are mine and I teach using lesson horses. The whole purpose for doing just ten (10) stalls is to limit the future use. With ten (10) horses, you only have the potential of ten (10) lessons per day. To have a big business, you have to have a lot of horses.

S. Duncanson inquired if there would be events on the property with a 10,000SF riding arena and where would multiple horse trailers park. J. Shiffer said she had no intention of holding events. S. Duncanson said there could be with the next owner. J. Levandowski said one of the benefits of having a site plan for a facility such as this is that a specific note could be added to the plan that would reference the equestrian use of the site and limit it to the current use, prohibit assembly or require future uses come back for approval. L. Shiffer said that the state statute for agriculture doesn't call out horse shows. She then explained the existing trailer parking. J. Langdell clarified that this Board is just trying to determine if there is sufficient room for what is being proposed.

J. Griffin, attorney for the applicant, stated that there will be no change in use; it is a continuation of what she's currently doing and she has no intention of having events on the property. Perhaps a limitation on the number of horses or trailers might be a good way to conditionally allow the use and retain some control. L. Shiffer said five (5) trailers would be a reasonable number to be able to evacuate the property due to fire or to trailer her horses to a show.

K. Bauer brought up the Building comments from the staff memo. J. Langdell stated that there has been much discussion in the office on this matter. J. Levandowski explained that the application was originally submitted for a private facility and all comments were based on a private use building. It has since been brought to our attention that there will be public entering the building, so these comments no longer apply. It is an agricultural use but different building codes will come in play. The referenced sixty (60') ft access pertained to strict requirements for agricultural exemptions for private use relative to the building code. This site plan is compliant for a commercial use. J. Griffin explained that this is not classified as a commercial use, but it is a commercial component of an agricultural use allowed by the Zoning Ordinance and the State RSA's promoting agricultural use. We will work with Code Enforcement to address all construction issues as part of the building permit process. J. Langdell said to approve this site plan, the Board has to know if the 60ft access is needed or not. C. Guida added that the architect is currently getting a written determination from the ICC Code Officials and explained the 60ft floor to sky requirement is a fire protection issue so that another structure doesn't catch fire. With that being said, we don't have anything within 60ft of this building. If it were to ever be an issue, we could cut some trees and create a sixty (60') ft area. J. Levandowski ended a brief discussion by saying that any changes to the site plan would be submitted at the next meeting.

Chairperson Langdell opened the public hearing.

J. Hopfenspirger said he has been here equally as long as Laurie, for twenty years. We have a great relationship and everything has been good. I've been happy with the way things have been run over there and she does a nice job. This is a very well done building; however, this is impacting us quite a bit. It is a 14,000SF building right outside our back door which is a concern and compounded with what he is hearing now. He is confused with all the terms being thrown around; residential, agricultural, and commercial. This is a residential area, period and I have a problem with commercial. I know what Ms. Shiffer does and I am fine with that, if it's commercial I am concerned about the next owner. This has to be resolved before you can say yes to approve this. Also, is there a landscaping provision? This building is 153 ft long and it will be right where I used to look out onto a beautiful pastoral area. I planted some trees that will work great in the summer, but could there be some evergreen plantings like hemlocks or arborvitae that would grow to give some additional buffer. This is an appealing looking building and they've done a tasteful job but it will be 153ft long, so there has to be some type of provision for us as abutters to have a buffer plan that helps mitigate or reduce the impact. J. Levandowski reiterated that use of the site has been and will be classified as agricultural or farming. Only the building construction will be classified as commercial because the commercial building code is triggered when there is public entering a building. J. Hopfenspirger said commercial makes him nuts and reiterated his concern about the next owner. He spoke with Laurie and she said nothing's changing, but things are changing and it will be a huge change. S. Duncanson referred to page 5 of the staff memo and said he can see a need for buffer along the front edge.

M. Johanson brought up the 60ft buffer around the building and said that if you cut the trees for that buffer, it clearly opens our property to the back of this building. S. Duncanson said there was a lot of land, at least 250 ft, between the abutter and the building so the 60 ft buffer shouldn't have an impact. J. Johanson said it will.

Chairperson Langdell closed the public portion of the meeting.

J. Langdell read correspondence from an abutter, Annmarie Pinal Turcotte dated 2/15/14 and the memo from Conservation Commission dated 2/24/14. Since this application is coming back for regional impact, it will allow time for the applicant to work with staff to get a final stormwater report, address the landscaping buffering along the roadway and get resolution to the 60 ft buffer. J. Griffin said we will come back next month with a landscaping/buffer plan, we will address all the abutters' concerns, we will come back with some parameters for wording that will ensure future use for the Board to consider as a possible condition and we will also add notes to

reflect the Conservation Commission's recommendations. The contractor also wanted me to point out that the one-story/two-story requirements are still subject to debate and we will have an answer to that as well.

T. Sloan inquired if there would be sanitary facilities on site. C. Guida said a bathroom is proposed in the small office area next to the tack room. We also have subsurface approval from the State. T. Sloan inquired about the horse washing water. C. Guida said we will most likely put that into the system as well. It is designed for 300 gallons per day and there will be a Zabel filter system. L. Shiffer added that she is on a well so there is very strict water usage. T. Sloan said the wash water might be able to go into a treatment swale. S. Duncanson said it was considered gray water and it could. T. Sloan inquired if the trees that were mentioned for cutting would be part of the 50% basal area of the wetland and buffer. C. Guida described the area in said he would review and clarify. T. Sloan also suggested that the placement of the proposed trees take the location of the horses into consideration.

C. Beer said he would prefer the applicant not move forward with a restriction that would limit the number of trailers because when we have a birthday party at our house, we have more than five vehicles. J. Langdell clarified that the limitation was to ensure enough parking and they will come back with some language options.

K. Bauer referenced the RSA and asked if there was a restriction on the amount of riding instruction. J. Levandowski replied no. T. Sloan said it is up to the Planning Board to analyze and determine what is reasonable and to somehow constrain the use. K. Bauer said the building is attractive but it is very large. T. Sloan reiterated that boarding, riding lessons, and riding arena are defined as agricultural uses and agricultural use is permitted in the zone. The building has to be constructed to the International Building Code according to the use of the structure but it doesn't define our analysis. S. Duncanson said the commercial wording shouldn't have been used. It is a matter of how the building code is interpreted. This will still be an agricultural building but with public usage; it's not a commercial building. L. Shiffer explained the riding operations and said you can't safely have ten (10) horses in that arena at the same time, and her insurance would not allow that. Although it sounds large, a 150' x 75' is the smallest indoor building she could construct to accommodate three (3) horses being ridden at the same time. I went this route for my neighbors.

T. Sloan made a motion to table the application to the 3/18/14 meeting to allow for the regional impact process and for the applicant to come back with a final stormwater report, a landscaping plan and the items discussed. S. Duncanson seconded and all in favor.

John Samonas/TMC CF of New England LLC – Nashua St – Map 44, Lot 11; Public Hearing for a major site plan for a proposed retail convenience store and gas sales with associated site improvements.

No abutters were present.

Chairperson Langdell recognized:

A.J. Barbato, T. M. Crowley & Associates, Inc.

Garrett Wood, T. M. Crowley & Associates, Inc.

Jason Plourde, Tighe & Bond

Chris Tymula, MHF Design Consultants, Inc.

John Smolak, Smolak & Vaughn, LLP

J. Langdell read the notice into the record and stated that the application was complete per the staff memo. C. Beer made a motion to accept the application. T. Sloan seconded. S. Duncanson abstained and all else in favor. T. Sloan made a motion that this application did not pose potential regional impact. C. Beer seconded. S. Duncanson abstained and all else in favor. S. Wilson read the abutters list into the record.

C. Tymula presented the site plan set dated 1/20/14 and gave a brief history of the site. The proposal is for a 4,513 SF convenience store with a gas canopy in front, housing four (4) dispenser islands and eight (8) pump stations. Two new 20,000 gallon underground fuel tanks will store 40,000 gallons of diesel, premium and regular fuel on site. We are providing a ten (10') ft sidewalk along the front of the building, a proposed air tower and the trash will be enclosed in back. We will be increasing the green space throughout the site and actually removing 1,500 SF of pavement currently within the wetland buffer. There will be two full access points on the side driveway and a right in and right out on 101A. There will be granite curbing and pedestrian sidewalk access to

the site. There will be twenty-four (24) parking spaces and one (1) ADA compliant space in front of the building. We will remove the existing infrastructure on the pad-ready site but will try to reuse or relocate the utilities and the pavement removal will result in an 800 SF reduction of impervious surface. We really tried to balance the site from a grading and drainage perspective. He reviewed the closed drainage system that eventually discharges out to the back of the site. The canopy and roof runoff will be discharged into an underground system that will go into the infiltration system. All the catch basins will be designed with oil hoods.

C. Tymula reviewed the erosion control measures and staff recommendations. We have no issue replacing the silt fence with hay wattles. The utility and landscaping plans were reviewed. The monument sign shown is lower than originally proposed and the sign package will go through the permit process. We will not be modifying the master box or transformer pad that is on site currently. The lighting plan is fully shielded and dark sky compliant. All mechanicals will be screened behind the building. A photo simulation based on the Leominster site, showing the canopy and building, and materials board was presented. The architectural depict a very New England style building with faux dormers, columns and cultured stone around the base. There will also be a seasonal patio area, a nice amenity for customers.

Staff comments

C. Tymula stated that rain gardens are not a recommended stormwater BMP for this type of use. It introduces the potential for any type of spill to go right into the groundwater system. We prefer to leave the existing closed system as is. There is a water quality unit that will maintain and manage the system. We have also provided a comprehensive long term operation maintenance plan and manual. We have no issue with adding a row of medium growth plantings per Conservation's comments.

K. Bauer brought up the MFD comments and said that the Fire Department takes the width requirements seriously because with snow, 15ft could possibly be reduced to 12ft. Is this a fire requirement and can they be made 20 ft as requested. C. Tymula said he didn't think there was an issue with the width; we met with DPW and Community Development staff and the layout was ok'd. We did run a truck turning template for a tanker delivery truck and fifteen (15') ft was more than enough room so there would also be enough room for fire apparatus. J. Levandowski stated that this plan meets our Town standards and she will inquire about the 20 ft width requirement. J. Plourde read the Town of Milford Driveway Regulations and said that the minimum width for all driveways shall be 10 feet. R. Riendeau said he was not sure where the 20 ft requirement came about, but these accesses are at an angle and fifteen (15') ft is better. J. Langdell stated we will need to get clarification from the Fire Department.

Traffic

J. Plourde said this site was already reviewed and approved for a 99 Restaurant and the mitigation measures associated with that development were implemented. A lot of coordination took place with the DOT because the other signals to the east of this intersection, at the Stop & Shop and 101 entrance ramps, are controlled by the State. This signal is under local jurisdiction, so there was a lot of coordination on the original development, and I did work on that project for the permitting of that development. From a traffic engineering standpoint, we look at the land use, not the tenant and this site was looked at as a high turnover sit down restaurant; a 99 Restaurant or a Denny's. We looked at weekday morning and afternoon as well as Saturday midday trip generated traffic. For the Cumberland Farms project, we met with staff early on to see what the Town would be looking for as far as evaluation of multi-modal transportation there. We came up with an understanding and put together a trip generation safety assessment. We looked at and evaluated at crash data from the Milford Police Department to determine if there was a safety problem today and if so, would this exacerbate that condition. There were approximately three (3) collisions per year at the intersection. Although some may have taken place inside Shaw's or Walgreens' parking lots, all have been associated and grouped with the intersection. A general rule is that five (5) or more per year are indicative of a safety problem and we are below that. There does not appear to be a safety concern here. We follow three standards for safe sight distance; the national standard AASHTO with requirements based on speed limits for stopping sight distance and intersection sight distance, the NH DOT all season safe sight distance which requires 400ft of safe sight lines under all conditions, and Milford's safe sight distance requirement which is 300ft. We meet all three sight distance standards. When we previously presented the conceptual plan to the Board, one of the primary concerns was the proximity of the right turn in driveway to the McDonald's driveway and an eastbound traveler wouldn't know which driveway to turn into. As a result, the

right turn in drive was moved further to the west so there wouldn't be that type of conflict. For separation we have provided; 80ft from the signal to the right in driveway, 80ft between our right in and right out driveways and 60ft between our right out driveway and the McDonalds right in driveway. All those are in conformance with Milford's 50ft spacing requirements. It is important to have a right turn exit out onto Nashua St for fuel truck access. The right turn in is also important so that people will be able to find their way onto the site and he referenced the Dunkin Donuts on 101A in Amherst where drivers, who are unfamiliar with the area, miss the entrance because they missed the opportunity to turn in at the signaled intersection and try to go into the exit only drive. There is a difference in speed limit between that example and here where it is posted at 30 mph, but we prefer to take care of any safety issues during the design process. We also met with Bill Parker and Rick Riendeau and NH DOT to get their input and address any concerns before we went ahead with the design.

C. Beer inquired why there was a separation for the drives and could you move the right in to meet the right out and have them both at the same location. J. Plourde replied that we originally had that layout on the conceptual plan but it was closer to the McDonald's property and reiterated the Board's concerns about confusion with entrances. The primary reason for a right in driveway is a matter of convenience for customers and trip generation from the standard database for types of trips being made. J. Langdell said Walgreens customers without entrance or exit on Nashua St don't seem to have a problem. J. Plourde replied that they are different uses with different generating characteristics. While Cumberland Farms will generate more traffic than Walgreens, it will be from pass-by trips, or cars already in the roadway system. Walgreens traffic is generated from new car trips, vehicles specifically going to Walgreens, rather than pass-by trips. Convenience stores draw 60% of their traffic from vehicles already in the roadway system. It's also a difference of location because if Walgreens wanted to put in a driveway they would have to break open the curb where existing turn lanes are situated. C. Beer asked if the intersection, as designed, can support the additional traffic from Cumberland Farms? J. Plourde replied yes, with the proposed curb cuts on Nashua St. The intersection does not function correctly today because there is a problem with the signal due to a faulty video camera card. Without the proposed right turn out, the intersection would need more green time to process the cars and steal it from the Nashua St side. The right turn in would not impact the signal operations but it would from a corridor convenience operations perspective. We don't want to create any safety concerns or confusion for drivers.

J. Langdell said it would be interesting to see data from Amherst of how many times people make that inappropriate turn going into the Dunkin Donuts exit. It would also have been better if you could have come in sooner and McDonalds come in later so that we could have jointly coordinated this improvement to gain better access management for the whole area. That said, it can't be done now. J. Plourde said Cumberland Farms is very comparable to the 99 Restaurant in regards to traffic impacts to the roadway system and the traffic signal operation.

S. Duncanson expressed concern with the measurements from the right out of Cumberland Farms to the right in of the McDonalds driveway. He felt that was too tight because this is a complete radius and is one driveway leading into another. My concern is with cars exiting Cumberland Farms and not seeing a car entering McDonalds. I regularly see how crazy the Leominster Cumberland Farms gets and can see this being an issue here with drivers not paying attention. J. Plourde explained the measurement on the plan.

T. Sloan added that a car intending to turn into the McDonalds drive could enter the Cumberland Farms right out instead. S. Duncanson agreed saying the right in should be eliminated and the right out be moved further west. J. Plourde reiterated that we did meet with Rick Riendeau, he reviewed the plans and the driveway is designed in accordance with the Town's standards. J. Langdell said we have a right, based on our expertise and knowledge of the community and this specific site to negotiate something different. K. Bauer agreed with Steve that heading east it is too tight. J. Langdell referenced the staff comments and noted that the Building, Ambulance and Fire Departments also have concern with these access points. C. Tymula said it was his understanding that the normal staff roundtable session did not take place, due to all the snow, where those comments would have been taken into consideration and addressed prior to the staff memo.

B. Parker added that the applicant did ask if we wanted to meet again and we said no, we didn't see a reason to do so. The curb cuts exceed the Town's standards that include full vehicle movement while these are restricted to

one-way in and one-way out. That adds another degree of safety for both access points as well as the signal that stops traffic allowing people to exit and enter.

K. Bauer asked how a customer, heading east, would navigate the site to get to the convenience store using the right in from Nashua St. C. Tymula went over the plan and said there would be plenty of room to get around the site without any issues from both a circulation and safety standpoint. There is 38ft from the gas dispenser bollard to the curb cut; room for two car lengths.

Chairperson opened the hearing for public comment; there being none, the public portion was closed.

T. Sloan said that if the one-way ingress were eliminated, it would be less prone to accidents waiting-to-happen. Another pertinent point is that this wasn't a current traffic study. J. Plourde clarified that we counted the signalized intersection as well as the cars going along the shared driveway. The original traffic study was done in 2008. T. Sloan noted that although the speed limit is 30 mph, the speed at which vehicles travel along that roadway is over 40 mph. Is it adequate to perform an analysis if you don't take the accurate speed into your study? I do want a gas station there for my convenience, but my concern is that it's an overuse of the site. J. Plourde said he understands the concern but to put this into perspective, the speed studies conducted along Nashua St for the 99 Restaurant were done prior to the signal installation which affects the speed and flow, so all conditions have been taken into consideration with this analysis. T. Sloan suggested that appropriate adjustments be made to the signalization to correct the existing issue. C. Tymula said we understand the concerns of the Board and also understand that the Board is not DPW and not Community Development but we felt we got the guidance we needed from the Board and staff and we feel it's a safe project altogether. We've tried to do everything we could to design this to make the site work for Cumberland Farms, for the Town and to alleviate your concerns with traffic and safety; however, the need for this additional entry is crucial for the retail component of the business and if you cut off this access point you cut off patronage. J. Langdell said there were concerns clearly voiced about having a right in and right out on Nashua St when the conceptual plan was originally presented to the Board, so this is not something new.

Environmental

C. Tymula explained that each of the catch basins will have an oil hood and we are not altering the existing bio retention swale. Because this is a motor vehicle fueling station and it is in the groundwater protection district, it's really not a good idea to infiltrate any on-site stormwater runoff; everything will go through the catch basins and discharge out through the water quality inlet to be pre-treated before it reaches the wetlands. The bio retention swale will take runoff from the back of the site that's not paved and any overflow from the roof runoff. Since he was not involved with the original design of the bio retention swale, he does not know what volume it can handle. J. Levandowski added that Fred Elkind has received and reviewed the stormwater permit application, but has not seen the revisions made to date.

Pedestrian movement

J. Plourde said there has been discussion with Rick Riendeau and Bill Parker as to whether we want to cross people at this location or if there is a more ideal location. A pedestrian crossing here would stop all lanes of traffic and that would then impact and require improvements the State locations. J. Langdell clarified that what you're saying is that there could not be a pedestrian crossing anywhere between the Stop & Shop plaza and this location. J. Plourde said the Ponemah Hill Rd intersection, if signalized might be a more ideal location. J. Langdell noted that there is no sidewalk on that side of the road; the existing sidewalk plan is only for the south side of Nashua St going as far as Medlyn Monument. J. Plourde said ideally, it is better to cross over a shorter distance through a fewer number of lanes and agrees that it is definitely a safety concern when people cross in an unsignalized location.

K. Bauer said we have talked a lot about getting sidewalks along Nashua St for the reasons discussed. We also have a horrendous traffic situation here anyway. I understand the needs of Cumberland Farms; however, this will add to the traffic problem we have there and it sounds like no pedestrian improvements are going to be made. J. Langdell clarified that there is a sidewalk in front of this site now. J. Levandowski said staff has no issue with the plan other than a few revisions and notes to be added. Staff feels the applicant has made every effort to comply with all town regulations and in some cases exceeds the regulations. We have no further comment.

Nashua St Improvements

C. Tymula said the driveways could be widened to meet the 20ft Fire Department request and Cumberland Farms is willing to contribute to the sidewalk fund. B. Parker spoke to past applications; Burger King did not contribute, and Walgreens, Nashua Eye and Giorgio's contributed as part of the site plan approval. Staff brought a dollar value to the Planning Board and it was made part of the conditions for approval. C. Tymula said maybe it could be a mix of some of the signal component repairs and a contribution to the sidewalk fund, totaling in the range \$5,000-\$10,000. J. Langdell said she would personally like to know what the value of that contribution and repairs would be. She is not opposed to the project or the entrance from the access road, but does struggle with the Nashua St component. We could table this for that information and also get an answer from the Fire Department regarding the access width and give time for Fred Elkind to comment on the revisions.

S. Duncanson made a motion to table the application to the 3/18/14 meeting to address the concerns voiced. C. Beer seconded for discussion and said he'd rather have resolution to the access width and see if the roundtable could be scheduled and get consensus to entrance and exit configuration. I personally don't care for them, but if the Town officials are ok with them, I won't raise any objection. J. Langdell said she would like Fire and Building staff to weigh in as well. K. Bauer said we still have no answer to the crosswalk situation. J. Langdell added that she can see this as a pedestrian destination. The vote was called and all in favor.

Chairperson Langdell called for a brief recess.

St. Joseph Hospital et.al./Milford Medical Center – Nashua St – Map 31, Lots 32 & 32-1 and Map 32, Lot 1; Public Hearing for a lot line adjustment involving three (3) lots.

No abutters were present:

Chairperson Langdell recognized:

Kyle Burchard, Meridian Land Services, Inc.

Danielle Santos, Lavallee Brensinger Architects

Bob Demers, St Joseph's Hospital

Melissa Sears, St Joseph's Hospital

Brad Westgate, Winer & Bennett

J. Langdell read the notice into the record and noted that the application was complete per the staff memo. C. Beer made a motion to accept the application. S. Duncanson seconded and all in favor. S. Duncanson made a motion that this application did not pose potential regional impact. C. Beer seconded and all in favor. S. Wilson read the abutters list into the record and noted that the list included all towns identified as having regional impact from the site plan application.

B. Westgate gave a brief overview of the parcels, the current conditions with the shared driveway and the ownership. This plan is to adjust three lots so that the medical center and all its parking will be entirely contained on one single parcel and the reconfigured driveway system will still be shared. The front portion of the driveway will be on town land and we have a shared access arrangement. All costs to construct and maintain the driveway up to the Kaley Park entrance will be fully borne by St. Joseph's. This application will facilitate a land exchange with the Town and the public hearings are scheduled before the Board of Selectmen for 3/10/14 and 3/24/14 with the voting to take place sometime early April. K. Burchard made the point that the site plan application is not dependent on the approval of this lot line plan. B. Westgate said the site plan contemplates an either-or scenario where the easements will change depending on the location of the driveway and parking. This plan also addresses and depicts the frontage area where there is no plan of record for the strips of land along Nashua St owned by St. Joseph's that St. Joseph's is willing to dedicate towards the Nashua Street widening.

K. Burchard presented plans dated 2/5/14 and reviewed the individual parcels to be conveyed. The previous dedications shown on prior plans were never recorded so this plan will describe that land. The primary driver for doing the parcel swap in this configuration is to avoid any conflicts with the proposed retaining wall and there is less land being exchanged than originally proposed, only 15,487 SF. The easement will grant access to all visitors of Kaley Park and the hospital in perpetuity. J. Langdell asked if the current easement for Kaley Park grants access in perpetuity now. B. Westgate said the Town's easement through the medical center was only on a

temporary basis and was never made permanent on paper. St. Joseph's has a very small permanent easement on Kaley Park land and we would make all permanent without constraint. K. Burchard stated that all the easement and dedications are shown on the plan. Langdell added that the permanent easements would be an improvement on what we currently have. She then inquired if more than the sidewalk land was being dedicated for the widening and if the sidewalk was inside of the proposed dedication strip. K. Burchard replied yes, this plan shows the final ultimate location of the future sidewalk with the widening of Nashua St. When all is said and done, the sidewalk running alongside the completed widening of Nashua St will all be within the right of way, for the Town to maintain.

Chairperson Langdell opened the hearing to public comment; there being none, the public portion of the meeting was closed. There were no other comments from the Board.

S. Duncanson made a motion that the Planning Board favorably recommend the land exchange be approved by the Board of Selectmen. J. Plant seconded and all in favor. S. Duncanson made a motion to approve the application, subject to the condition that the recording of the lot line adjustment plans be simultaneous with the recording of the deeds that affect the land exchange and the dedicated frontage area for the potential future road widening and sidewalk reconstruction. J. Plant seconded and all in favor.

OLD BUSINESS

St. Joseph Hospital et.al./Milford Medical Center – Nashua St – Map 31, Lots 32 & 32-1 & Map 32, Lot 1; Major site plan to construct a new medical facility with associated site improvements and; respective waiver requests from the Milford Zoning Ordinance, Article VI, Section 6.05.0; *Nashua and Elm Street Corridor District*, in accordance with the Milford Development Regulations, Section 5.020. *(Tabled from 1/21/14)*
No abutters were present:

Chairperson Langdell recognized:
Kyle Burchard, Meridian Land Services, Inc.
Danielle Santos, Lavallee Brensinger Architects
Bob Demers, St Joseph's Hospital
Melissa Sears, St Joseph's Hospital
Brad Westgate, Winer & Bennett

J. Langdell noted that Selectmen's minutes from the 12/23/13 BOS meeting were referenced at the last meeting, and after reviewing the video, it was discovered those minutes contained a misquote. They should have stated that Attorney Westgate did answer a question from Chairman Daniels that at this time St. Joseph's Hospital was not intending to pay for widening the road. This was detailed in correspondence from Attorney Westgate dated 2/4/14.

B. Westgate stated that we have been working with staff and our discussions have been detailed in the staff memo dated 2/25/14.

Architecturals

D. Santos presented revised plans dated 1/15/14 and 2/25/14 that include a views from the abutter's yard on Linden St and aerials as well as sample materials. She recapped the previous meetings and resulting adjustments. We have tried to make the facility as compact as possible and it will pretty much be a square footage swap from what is currently on the property. We did a comparison of the existing 21,000 SF building that includes the urgent care center, house and barn and the new building with a 13,000 SF footprint and a 6,200 SF second floor. They will be similar but each department has been better configured to serve the population. The building is broken up into three parts to help break up the mass. The building height will be within requirements at 33 ½ ft based on an average elevation from the base of the building. The asphalt shingles and stone will be identical to what is used at the medical office building in back. The clapboard-like siding will help bring down the scale and the color will be similar to give all the buildings more of a campus feel. We've revised the window arrangements. The community room will be a more prominent space but still accessed through the main entrance. There will be a partial 1,300 SF basement located in the back corner of the new facility that will house the mechanical room, utility connections and a small office with internal and external access. There will be a solid screen vinyl fence,

set on a slightly higher level, to block most of the view to the MRI area and we continue to meet with the abutters to refine and review any concerns. The Board reviewed all the architectural renderings. S. Robinson noted that these renderings made the building look smaller and fit more into the surrounding area.

Waivers

K. Burchard read from the 12/23/13 memo addressing the waiver requests and presented a zoning map to show the property in context with the Nashua St Corridor. It is in a unique position with unique constraints that make it challenging to comply with the overlay district standards. J. Langdell noted that was precisely why we put in a waiver clause. K. Burchard went over the details:

Transportation standards 6.05.6.B

1a. Interconnecting Drives to Adjacent Properties; because of the residential parcels, the cemetery and the wetlands it is difficult and impractical to connect a commercial property to the residential parcels and cemetery. There was consensus from the Board that it was clearly not feasible here.

1b. Limiting access points; we comply and are not requesting a waiver.

1c. Interior Parking Interconnection; we are not proposing an interior parking connection and want to keep separation between the physicians parking lot to the west and the visitor/patient parking to the east as well as limiting access to the MRI dock area. We are keeping other interior patient parking connections. J. Langdell stated that this meets the spirit of the Ordinance by connecting all the other pieces while there is clearly a reason for the separation of the physicians' lot and will also help to decrease the amount traffic going onto Linden St. A waiver would not be needed.

1d. Throat Length and Stacking; we comply.

1e. Interconnecting Movements; the same rationale used for interconnecting drives applies and no waiver is needed.

2a. Transit Points; there is no master transportation plan but a waiver is needed due to the language.

3a. Bicycle Facilities; we don't have a route planned and feel it would be a hazard to the facilities, but we do make accommodations for bicycle visitors with a bike rack at the southwest corner. There was consensus from the Board to not require bicycle facilities.

4a. Sidewalk Accessibility; we comply and no waiver requested.

4b. Sidewalk to roadway buffer; it's a choice between the planted buffer or a sidewalk to roadway buffer. J. Langdell said with the uniqueness and needs of this site, this design has met the spirit of the Ordinance and what we're trying to accomplish.

4c. Pedestrian Convenience; there are sidewalks coming into the property. J. Langdell added that is a huge benefit.

4d. Pedestrian Scale; we comply.

4e. DPW Specs; we comply.

Site Design Standards 6.05.6.C

1. Natural Features; we comply.

2a. Parking Lots to the Rear or Side; we do not comply due to PSNH easements and need to connect the whole facility together prohibits a rear parking area. J. Langdell said there has been significant discussion and details for parking since day one, so this is an area where we can grant a waiver to make it official.

2b. Parking Prohibited Along Frontage; same rationale.

2c. Side Yard Parking Buffer; same rationale.

2d. Shared Parking Provisions; there is a shared sidewalk between the two.

2e. Offsite Parking; this only applies if the land swap doesn't occur and if it doesn't occur we will still provide the easements to make that happen.

3. Build to zone; due to the constraints we cannot do this and a waiver will be needed due to the language.

4. Landscaping; we comply.

S. Duncanson made a motion to grant the following waivers, from the Nashua Street Corridor Design Guidelines under the Town of Milford Zoning Ordinance, Article VI, for Sections: *6.05.6:B.2a Transit Points*, *6.05.6:B.2b Transit Encouragement*, *6.05.6:C.2a Parking Lots to the Rear or Side*, *6.05.6:C.2b Parking Prohibited Along Frontage*, *6.05.6:C.2c Side Yard Parking Buffer*, and *6.05.6:C.3 Build to Zone* with the condition that they be noted on the plan. C. Beer seconded and all in favor.

Board and Staff Comments

Sheet SP5 shows the parking counts during the variance stages of construction. The size of the stormwater focal points were increased because we monitored the ones installed at the McKelvie School in Bedford and found that the manufacturer's specifications weren't enough to function properly. It is the position of the medical center and the medical office building to not change anything pertaining to the addressing and keep it they are because there is a lot tied to the address and there is a ripple effect. J. Levandowski said she will get clarification from Dana MacAllister regarding E911 numbering. K. Burchard said the Linden St egress will remain exit only. We will get the stormwater plan submittals to Fred Elkind and the State. The emergency generator will be stationed between the buildings and will not be visible above the proposed six (6) ft fence. S. Duncanson asked if it meets the new 2014 DEP standards. K. Burchard answered he assumed so. He reviewed the site's signage on EXH-4 and noted that a sign variance will be required. B. Westgate said the variance will be for the size of the sign and our goal is not to exceed what is allowed if the building were on the other side of the street. There will not be any issues with sight line visibility.

There was discussion staff recommendation #1. J. Langdell wanted to ensure that the review was far enough along the process before she signed the final plan. B. Westgate added that staff recommendation #8 should include the detailed components of the waivers, and items #11, #12, and #13 should be prefaced by "adding a note to the plan" along with adding the notes.

J. Langdell said that the plans are based on ten (10) physicians and thirty-seven (37) employees; is that what is currently there? K. Burchard replied yes, that is the tally today. All the available space in the medical office building in the rear is being used, but not all of the front building. There are offices scattered throughout the farm house and barn that are not of a consistent use but don't know what that frequency of use is. J. Langdell asked if, when this building is built, there will be space for more than the current staff. K. Burchard said based on this plan, no; they will be maintaining the same staff. M. Sears explained that portions of the current building are not in use because they are uninhabitable, so part of the reason the new building will be the same size is because the existing building doesn't meet modern day codes for room sizes and other things. It is actually undersized for the current amount of patient care we deliver. To meet codes for exam room sizes and other requirements, the minimum square footage to do what we're doing there happens to be fully utilized. It is a replacement facility and is not built for growth. The new building will be better configured so that all the spaces will be designed and constructed to deliver the specific needs of physical therapy and urgent care, instead of a converted horse barn. There are actually fewer people working there from when the plans were first proposed as a result of the conversion to urgent care. The second floor will not be fitted up when we open the building, it will be a cold/warm shell used for storage. We have no plans for it as of yet; however, there would be no ability to expand on that site once this is built, so it will be future space should we need it and reiterated that there are no plans to utilize it in the near term. J. Langdell said you are creating potential for more use on site for the future which gets back to all our previous discussions on traffic and traffic patterns and needs of that site going forward. M. Sears added that when parts of the building became uninhabitable, we moved services offsite. There used to be an orthopedic practice, a podiatry practice and a midwifery practice there, so the amount of traffic going to that building is substantially less. We are seeing less patients and doing less in there than when the building was totally full. If we were to something with that second floor, ten years from now, it would likely come back to baseline to what it was when the building was fully utilized several years ago and it wouldn't be a net growth over the highest volume of patients we've served. J. Langdell noted that the baseline was a while ago and everything else around it has changed too, but we move forward.

Nashua St widening

B. Westgate said that what Melissa stated was one of the fundamental elements of our thought process that the hospital not be required to pay for the widening. Historically, the hospital's position has always been that it would dedicate the land, now seen on the lot line adjustment plan, to permit the widening when the Town was to undertake the project. It kind of couples back to Kaley Park from the 1999 ZBA approval contemplated as a condition that when the second field was fully operational, the road widening would occur and the left turn lane capability would be implemented. So it would have been a Town project. Over the past week there have been discussions with Rick Riendeau, Jodie and Bill as far as the timing of work. The reconfigured aprons require new paving to integrate into the locust of Nashua St, so in effect, we're doing some of the paving that has to be a component of the road widening and there could be a field coordination effort. If the Town's timing can work with the hospital's timing to be built and open by June, 2015 then the parties can work together to do their

components of work in a manner that most efficiently implements the road widening. We're hopeful that makes sense to the Board and that leaving it to the hands on people makes the best approach.

J. Langdell referenced the submitted draft cost breakdown for the proposed roadwork and noted that this Board can strongly recommend an effort of coordination.

R. Riendeau said this is the time to do this work to save the town money; it's a plus for them and a plus for us and we can do the work in budget. It will be cheaper to do this now and there other components that we can do ourselves to save even more because we do have the gravel in-house. Those draft costs are based on highest cost. J. Langdell said that based on the draft construction costs the Town's portion would be 62% and St. Joseph's would be 38% if done now. It does show that there is participation with the widening. B. Westgate said these are distinct projects but can be coordinated in the field so that there will be control over the timing.

Chairperson Langdell opened discussion to the public; there being no comments, the public portion of the meeting was closed.

S. Duncanson made a motion to grant approval of the application subject to the fifteen (15) staff recommendations in the staff memo dated 2/25/14 and a recommendation that there be field coordination for the Nashua St widening. C. Beer seconded for discussion. There was no further discussion and all voted in favor.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:40pm.

MINUTES OF THE FEB 25, 2014 PLANNING BOARD PUBLIC HEARING APPROVED MARCH 18, 2014